

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/975,779	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gordon J Stock	2877	

All Participants:
Status of Application: after non-final

 (1) Gordon J Stock.

(3) _____.

 (2) Attorney Raj Dave.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 September 2004
Time: 2:45 pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4, 8

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


ZANDRA V. SMITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 8 was discussed to correct dependency. So claim 8 now is depended on claim 1 since claim 7 had been cancelled. For claims 1, 3, and 4, the operating step was discussed and amended to clarify the use of the term 'each track.' See attached Examiner's amendment. Also the abstract was discussed and amended to overcome a potential objection for not having proper content for the original abstract only purported merits of the invention. See attached Examiner's amendment for replacement abstract.